

**RALEIGH PARKS AND RECREATION PUBLIC PARTICIPATION POLICY AND GUIDELINES  
COMMENTS AND RESPONSES**

**No. Document Comment**

**Response 01/16/12**

**GENERAL COMMENTS**

1	General	I will take this opportunity to comment on how valuable these documents can be in establishing a friendlier and more trustworthy relationship between parks administration and interested citizens. Over the years of my involvement as a citizen of Raleigh I have known a few folks who take particular interest in various aspects of our city. I have known citizens who care about sign issues, storm water issues, housing issues - especially low-income and elderly housing, zoning, historic preservation, tree planting and preservation and of course parks. When citizen volunteers contribute their time, interest and expertise on behalf of issues that are meaningful to them the City and it's neighborhoods become stronger. Administrative staff and elected officials who see a citizen's expertise, knowledge, passion and/or creative ideas as an asset and engage the talents of the citizens can build meaningful collaborative relationships which are of benefit to all.	Our intent is to create an environment of public involvement in parks and recreation planning that is welcoming and encouraging to Raleigh residents, in which Parks and Recreation Department staff conduct themselves professionally and competently, and results in better outcomes for Raleigh.
2	General	These are very big changes being proposed and the documents are intimidatingly long and complicated. The public (with the Parks Board specially invited as part of the public) should have an opportunity to ask questions and receive answers about these proposed drafts BEFORE the end of the comment period. The PRGAB could benefit from hearing the types of questions the public may have and the issues that are brought up. All people need to fully understand what is being proposed before they make comments. In the interest of educating people to make fully informed decisions and comments, I would like to request that a public Q&A session be held before the deadline for comments and that the deadline of 3/5 be extended until after this can take place and allow people time to develop comments after the Q&A session.	The documents as a whole are intended to be comprehensive, in particular, designed to help the parks staff engage in the parks planning process. Hence, as a whole, they are lengthy, and agree - they take time to read through and to think about implications for decision-making. We would like the PRGAB, as a representative body of the public, to wrestle with this project, followed with additional forums for the public to engage. This will not happen before March 5. We are working with parks staff to develop a timeline because we also believe additional time should be provided to understand the additional changes - that not only encompass the Resolution process but offer other means of working with the public
3	General	I believe this process should fully model the principles outlined in the two documents that NRLI has drafted. In addition to helping build capacity and educate the public by answering questions and providing information requested, I think that there should be a complete process plan/design made available to the public to promote transparency and clarify how the process of refining these documents will unfold from start to finish, the timelines anticipated for each step, who is responsible for what, how decisions will be made and by whom, etc.	The comments generated at the public March 2010 public meeting and those provided via email and in written form have guided the succeeding drafts of the policy document, guidelines and the public participation manual (formerly the DOI). The next substantive draft of these documents will again be made available for public comment for review by the City Council.
4	General	I am very disappointed that my March 26 request for answers to relevant questions regarding these draft documents before the end of the comment period were refused by the Parks and Recreation Director earlier this month. This does not reflect well on this public participation process or on staff's willingness to provide citizens with what they need to provide informed comment. It also sets a bad precedent for future planning processes. I respectfully request that my questions, now listed in the March 25 meeting summary, be answered now that the official public comment period is over.	Done.
5	General	The fact that the April 12 comment period deadline has just been indefinitely extended in a murky way (via City news release) also contributes to a sense of a changing landscape and uncertainty about what will happen in the future or how the public should participate	The Department has posted its planning and public participation documents on its website and on the NRLI website
6	General	There must be assurances that any product from this process will be followed and not circumvented, which is what happened after the last policy development process	These assurances are made explicit by the City Council when it adopts the policy document.
7	General	Very excited about several ideas mentioned in the public participation documents, and actually excited about the documents. Several sections seem to address my concerns but I'm concerned about the Parks and Recreation Department side-stepping them. This is what I saw in the planning meeting I attended.	It is intended that the Department will be held accountable to the public participation principles of inclusivity and transparency specified in the Policy document.
8	General	Having participated as a PRGAB member in the development of several parks, I've learned it is very important for Parks and Recreation Departments to clearly state from the start what the department needs in the area where the new park is being developed. Unfortunately, that has not always been the case and meetings became very ugly, when the needs were listed at a subsequent meeting, after the public had been told at the first meeting, that the park was a blank slate, for them to design as they saw fit. This creates expectations that become very hard to change. For example, if Parks and Rec. needs another Little League baseball field in a park that should be stated at the first meeting including options as to where in the park this field will be located. No discussion for or against. The Parks and Rec. administration can document with enrollment numbers the need for this facility. Be clear about what is needed in the new park!!	The Public Participation Guidelines provide guidance to Department staff on how to work with the public to generate shared expectations for park design. We also have developed a set of "fact sheets" to help participants in parks planning processes understand how these processes work and how their input will be used in park planning decisions.

9	General	The Facilitator has to be impartial. Roberts Rules were totally ignored and the meetings were manipulated by the person's running the meeting and the consultants. They would personally attack anybody who did not agree with their opinions. In your process you mention how important it is to have persons who live close to the parks on the committee. When "the locals" would bring up concerns in the meetings, the facilitators and the consultants would ignore many of the ideas by saying that we were NIMBY's (Not In My Back Yard). This is a term I had never heard before.	The Public Participation Guidelines contain information on selecting skilled facilitators.
10	General	Involving the public into the decisions early on is a good idea. In addition, having a good representation of the local public to the park is important. As part of a Park's committee, I found the process of developing a park in committee very informative and by itself very workable. The most important thing that went wrong with the process of development was due to those implementing the process. If the majority of committee members are working for or with the parks department – there is a perception that their vote is "in the bag."	The Public Participation Guidelines provide guidance to Department staff on how to work with the public to generate shared expectations for park design. We also have developed a set of "fact sheets" to help participants in parks planning processes understand how these processes work and how their input will be used in park planning decisions.
11	General	I am not a policy wonk. I have read these documents and know there are other citizens who will provide more detailed feedback than I. I am hopeful that their careful study will be seen as an asset rather than a bother in our attempt to craft a useful policy and fair processes for planning our parks.	We received many useful and insightful comments.
12	General	It is very important that the refinement of these draft documents model the processes and principles that you have promoted and recommended in your former report and the new "Guidelines".	
13	General	I have been troubled over the years to witness and experience how my city's Parks and Recreation administration has been demeaning, dismissive and has marginalized citizens who have had much to offer. The lack of civility in public meetings by members of the PRGAB members to one another and by staff to citizens has been troubling, hurtful and unnecessary. It undermines civil discourse and the democratic process.	Our intent is to create an environment for public involvement in parks and recreation planning that is welcoming and encouraging to Raleigh residents, in which Parks and Recreation Department staff conduct themselves professionally and competently, and that results in better parks planning for Raleigh.
14	General	I appreciate the Director's comments at the public meeting, which were delivered with sincerity, to implement policies and operations to insure meaningful collaborative engagement between the department and citizens. However shifting a departmental culture that is entrenched takes great commitment as well as a willingness to change. Having accountability councils or groups that help foster skills and mentoring would be valuable.	Agreed.
15	General	How can these Guidelines, Policies and Instructions - even if written with the most insightful language - be followed if there is little value for civility? How will these be used if the consultants are not available to coach and mentor staff? Does our staff need to be coached and mentored for these policies to be implemented?	One component of this project is for the public participation consultants (NRLI) to mentor parks planning staff in conducting their public participation processes.
16	General	Over the years I have said we need to keep the public in public parks. I look forward to seeing a revival of public engagement on behalf of our public commons and public parks in Raleigh. The actual numbers of citizens who know and care deeply about parks is a small percentage of the total population. The Department needs to embrace them and treat them as valuable resources. None of us would keep on speaking up or reading these materials and attending the meetings if we didn't really care about our city, our public places, about the health of our community and enriching experiences of all kinds, for all ages of our citizens.	Our intent is to create an environment of public involvement in parks and recreation planning that is welcoming and encouraging to Raleigh residents, in which Parks and Recreation Department staff conduct themselves professionally and competently, and results in better outcomes for Raleigh.
17	General	My impression is that we've gone from a 12 page, relatively clear, user-friendly, and non-problematic park master planning policy to three separate documents, including over 60 pages that are confusing and not well coordinated, and that do not give the public the same opportunity to participate in park planning decisions or equal guarantee of rights regarding notification procedures, access to information, and other important provisions. (Equal compared to our existing policy.) We have taken a step backward, not forward, with these documents, especially the Departmental Operating Instructions (DOI).	The purpose of this effort is to develop a comprehensive public participation policy that is based on sound principles and best practices, that is consistent for all Department park planning processes, and enhances procedural flexibility to allow for context-appropriate public engagement processes. The policy it is designed to replace does indeed describe a park planning process that is inclusive, transparent, and collaborative, yet lacks sufficient procedural detail and flexibility to make it practicable in all cases. The new policy attempts to address these shortcomings.
18	General	The three documents are very comprehensive and will serve as an excellent foundation for future planning. Hopefully these will be seen as "living documents" subject to revision, in particular the specific processes, as experience is gained.	It is intended that Department staff will increase their capacity to engage the public in meaningful participatory processes. As new information is gained to better inform these processes, these documents will be updated
19	General	Surprised at the confusion of new material. I counted 7 different documents - over 300 pages of material - related to this policy. I feel that you took a 14 page resolution (2003)-735 - and generated enough additional material to muddle it beyond recognition. As a member of the public I am very disappointed - it doesn't appear that you even kept your initial report or the public in mind when doing this.	Three documents were generated in this project totalling 89 pages.
20	General	The roles and responsibilities should be the same in the three documents and need to be addressed in the draft.	The way that roles and responsibilities are identified has been changed in the final draft. Instead of identifying responsible entities and listing the tasks attributed to each, we have describe the actions related to parks planning and public participation in a flow chart. The entities who hold primary responsibility and implementation responsibilities for each stage of the public participation process are listed.
21	General	Section on <i>Public Participation Policy for Park Planning</i> . (PPPFPP) Revisit title; alliteration seems odd for such an important policy. (Say it three times fast.) Even the abbreviation is odd	Although the title may pose some alliterative challenges, it accurately describes the contents of the document.

22	General	Please improve user-friendliness. Right now it does not seem to be a working document for park planning. I'd like to stay informed about where this effort goes from here.	We have strived to improve user friendliness by simplifying and unifying the policy document and the staff planning manual. In addition, we created a parks planning and public participation flow chart, and a set of public participation fact sheets. These changes should provide a much more streamlined description of the public's role in park planning.
23	General	I realize that the goal was to try to improve things by removing certain sections of the Resolution and moving them elsewhere, but instead, it has made it all more confusing, scattered, harder to use in practical terms, and will result in poor accountability. For example, the parts that were moved to Appendix B of the Guidelines should be returned in their original form	We have strived to improve user friendliness by simplifying and unifying the policy document and the staff planning manual. In addition, we created a parks planning and public participation flow chart, and a set of public participation fact sheets. These changes should provide a much more streamlined description of the public's role in park planning.
24	General	If there were serious management and implementation problems with a somewhat prescriptive process (Resolution), as well as a less prescriptive process before that (the former guidelines), does it really make sense to move toward more flexibility and loopholes that would open the door for future problems – before more serious training of staff and the PRGAB takes place and before there is a period of working within a prescriptive system to build trust? <u>The level of flexibility proposed here is simply too much for an environment that has shown such significant problems with implementation and management</u> A more prescriptive process is needed to protect public rights to information, reasonable notifications, and environmental protection. What the public sees very recently in current park planning efforts does not show that the staff is making a strong effort to follow the guidance in the proposed policy or guidelines.	Department staff are being trained in collaborative processes through the NRLI program at NCSU. It is recognized that building flexibility into the Department's public involvement process can result in practices that violate the principles contained in the policy document. However, it is through the policy document that the Department can and should be held accountable to upholding the principles of meaningful public participation.
25	General	While I generally like the Public Participation Policy and Guidelines and think they're a good idea, I do not think they are sufficient to ensure accountability and transparency in park master planning or comprehensive park system planning. The policy is a broad policy document, not specific enough to accomplish building legitimacy, quality and capacity. The crafting of these policies needs to take into consideration the continuing sense of distrust that exists on the part of the public. I applaud the Parks Dept. for their new commitment to meaningful public participation, but this claim should not allow them the latitude that these documents provide, given our recent history -- let this latitude come later, when they have built a track record, the processes are evaluated, and the public understands by experience that things are different and trust is built.	The intent of the policy document is to hold all parties accountable to the principles of public participation, and provide sufficient flexibility to Department staff to design public involvement processes that are appropriate to the context in which they are to take place.
26	General	One of the criticisms of the Community Meeting process was that it wasn't transparent. How have you corrected for this in the policy in a way that really creates accountability?	We have provided guidance on improving process transparency in all three documents produced in this effort.
27	General	I understand you're recommending more flexibility than was possible under the Resolution process, for example to allow a Community Meeting format to be used in certain circumstances or for a facilitator to have the flexibility to run a meeting in a way suited to the task at hand. The park master planning policy, however, should remain prescriptive when it comes to standard operating procedures such as information accessibility, process selection and design steps, parts of the process that promote transparency, etc.	Guidelines for park planning and development are clearly specified in the document titled, "Pubic Participation Manual for Park Planning." This document establishes procedures for the Department of Parks and Recreation to reach a Council-adopted Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment or Master Plan Revision for undeveloped or partially developed Parks and Recreation Department (the Department) sites. This document also applies to the System Integration Plan process and all processes intended to inform, involve, consult and collaborate with the public in park planning and development efforts.
28	General	Concerning park classifications being stated up front, this is a good idea but there should be some mechanism for a consensus seeking committee or advisory group to be able to report back to City Council if new information appears to point to a need to question an originally proposed classification. This is important and was not allowed during the Horseshoe Farm process. Having Council weigh in on the confirmation or change of a park classification given new relevant information would help reduce controversy and contentiousness as the process proceeds.	Park classification is determined as part of the acquisition process at City Council, verified during SIP process, is an early information and education component of the master plan process, and is a part of the annual Comprehensive Plan update.
29	General	City Council should formally adopt any and all public participation policies to encourage better following of them as well as accountability.	The City Council will adopt any new public participation policies developed through this project.
30	General	There are major inconsistencies between these documents in critical points in the process of master planning that need to be corrected. Generally, it is disturbing how City Council's functions are being removed as this is where accountability is ensured.	The two documents that describe the responsible entities in park planning and public participation are the Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning (formerly the DOI). Both documents clearly identify the responsibilities of City Council, City Manager, Parks Director, PRGAB, and Parks Department staff in park planning and development. City Council retains the right to require and approve a planning action for any and all park properties. Moreover, the Council retains authority in approving the selection of park planning consultants, selection of consensus committees (formerly master planning committees), and adopting final plans.
31	General	Regarding authority and oversight, here are how things play out: Current Policy: City Council Department Operating Instructions: Parks and Rec Director and City Manager Public Participation Policy: Parks and Rec Director Public Participation Guidelines: "seek concurrence of City Council and PRGAB"	The City Council retains the right to require and approve a planning action for any and all park properties. Moreover, the Council retains authority in approving the selection of park planning consultants, selection of consensus committees (formerly master planning committees), and adopting final plans.

32	General	<p>Park Master Plan Approval Responsibility. Again, the three new documents all give conflicting guidance about who can approve or reject a proposed master plan.</p> <p>Current Policy: City Council  Department Operating Instructions: City Council  Public Participation Policy: Parks and Rec Director  Public Participation Guidelines: Parks, Recreation and Greenway Advisory Board (see Appendix B)</p>	<p>The park planning and public participation documents all clearly specify City Council's role in approving and adopting park master plans.</p>
33	General	<p>Process Selection and Design Responsibility. It is unclear how the public will participate in planning process selection and design. These are new, critical steps in the process, yet there is conflicting guidance about this aspect and very little direction about how the public should be informed it is going on and have an opportunity to comment. The roles of citizens and citizen master planning/consensus seeking committees are not outlined well compared to roles of staff and consultants, nor are arrangements made for citizens to have review and comment ability. The draft documents propose inconsistent guidance, and none of them are clear how the public will have access to information and the ability to provide input:</p> <p>Current Policy: City Council approves process selection. Department Operating Instructions: Parks &amp; Rec Director develops, City Manager approves (no public knowledge necessary)  Public Participation Policy: "processes should be designed collaboratively by the Dept. and those participating in them" (p. 2); this directly conflicts with "PRGAB reviews and advises on proposed public</p>	<p>The Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning are consistent in describing the processes and responsibilities for selecting appropriate public participation processes. The planning team, consisting of department staff and consultant if applicable, concurrent with PRGAB review, will conduct an assessment of the planning issues and potential stakeholders, identifies the appropriate public participation format, and designs a context-appropriate process.</p>
34	General	<p>It's important for accountability purposes to have City Council adopt all public participation policies and park master plans, because they are the policy decision makers for the City. Can these documents be changed to reflect that?</p>	<p>The City Council will adopt any new public participation policies developed through this project.</p>
35	General	<p>Given the history in the City of Raleigh regarding park planning and the amount of citizen suspicion of the park planning staff and the staff's disregard for consistency in following policy, lack of transparency and disrespectful treatment of citizens this document will have to become a well used resource if there is to be healing. I do not see any safeguards for insuring accountability that the guidelines will be followed and what actions will be taken when they are not followed.</p>	<p>The intent of the policy document is to hold all parties accountable to the principles of public participation, and provide sufficient flexibility to Department staff to design public involvement processes that are appropriate to the context in which they are to take place.</p>
36	General	<p>In Raleigh's democratic government our City Council is the final decision making authority. The current documents do not clearly state this fact. The DOI, page 2, States the P&amp;R director will be in responsible for master plan process design with recommendation by the design development administrator and approval by the City Manager. There is no mention of how the elected officials are engaged. This is an oversight that indicates another way to eliminate citizen participation as members of Council are elected citizens.</p>	<p>The role and authority of City Council are clearly defined in both the Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning. As stated in both documents, the City Council retains authority to require and approve a planning action for any and all park properties. Moreover, the Council retains authority in approving the selection of park planning consultants, selection of consensus committees (formerly master planning committees), and adopting final plans.</p>
37	General	<p>The fact that these three proposed policies, especially the DOI, remove so many of the public's basic rights to information, notification and clarity of process and product that were guaranteed in Resolution 2003-735 calls into question the staff's good faith intentions to carry out the City Council's charge, which was to rewrite the parks planning process according to recommendations outlined in the "Involving the Public" report by NRLI. City Council also asked that this process should include a policy of employing an independent observer to provide feedback throughout the implementation of the revised parks planning process; I couldn't find this anywhere in these three documents</p>	<p>It is the intent of the public participation policy, guidelines and DOI to assure transparency, access and inclusiveness in park and recreation planning activities. Issues related to access to information and notification will be addressed in the next draft. The contract with the NRLI does indeed include provisions for observation, assessment and feedback by an outside observer. The observer will provide mentoring and feedback on public participation process design, implementation and evaluation.</p>
38	General	<p>A large section of the Resolution was removed and revised and placed in the back of the guidelines as a sample group charter (Appendix B.) This means this can be changed at the will of the staff and committee, but these are important items that should apply to ALL processes (such as what a master plan should include and who approves a proposed master plan). Can all of this be returned to the policy and just referenced in this Appendix?</p>	<p>The intent of this effort was to provide the Department and participating public the flexibility necessary to design consensus-seeking processes so that they fit the context in which they are taking place. Basic planning parameters that pertain to every planning process are specified in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning. Establishing rigid process rules, such as the setting number of participants on a master planning committee, can create procedural difficulties and decrease the effectiveness of the planning effort.</p>
39	General	<p>When the charge came from the Public Works Committee and City Council, my understanding was that the recommendations of the Involving the Public report would be incorporated into what we already have, Resolution 2003-735, not that this policy would be thrown out entirely. Based on Councilor Stephenson's comments last night, it appears that he was under the same impression. The report said that this was a good policy and process and that it was the management and implementation of it that was the problem, not the policy itself. It makes more sense to start with this existing, well understood policy for park master planning, build in the core team format/feedback and consultation process, and reference it all back to the policy and guidelines – instead of creating the DOI that tries to separate planning instructions from public involvement instructions. The documents are very confusing as is and it is counter-productive to remove so much of what made park master planning successful in terms of promoting transparency and accountability.</p>	<p>The public participation process contained in Resolution 2003-735 is retained and is described in the policy guidelines as the "Consensus Seeking" process. The elements of Resolution 2003-735 that deal specifically with carrying out a park master plan were separated from those that address public participation procedures. This was done so as to allow the Consensus Seeking process to be used for other park planning activities. Elements of Resolution 2003-735 that specifically address park master planning are contained in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning (formerly the DOI). The Public Participation Manual for Park Planning clearly identifies the specific planning requirements specified in the Resolution, and more closely coincides with the public participation process descriptions contained in the guidelines.</p>

40	General	The only problem I see with Res 2003-735 is the attitude with which it is being applied. As I read between the lines and try to interpret the new document, I see a confusing, overly flexible process that appears to dilute the public process and the authority of their elected representatives. That puts the balance of power heavily with staff.	The intent of the policy document is to hold all parties accountable to the principles of public participation, and provide sufficient flexibility to Department staff to design public involvement processes that are appropriate to the context in which they are to take place. The City Council retains the right to require and approve a planning action for any and all park properties. Moreover, the Council retains authority in approving the selection of park planning consultants, selection of consensus committees (formerly master planning committees), and adopting final plans.
41	General	In the future, a link to the current City park master planning policy (Res. 2003-735) should be provided along with future draft documents and it should be made clear that this is what will be replaced with the proposed policies.	A link to Resolution 2003-735 has been provided on the Department's website along with the updated versions of the parks planning and public participation documents.
42	General	It would be helpful if you would post a link to the existing park master planning policy, Resolution 2003-735, so that people can have quick access to it and can more readily compare what we have now with what is being proposed.	A link to Resolution 2003-735 has been provided on the Department's website along with the updated versions of the parks planning and public participation documents.
43	General	Did we get rid of the "Master Plan Committee"? Maybe I did not understand the study correctly. I thought, as part of the study, we were looking at how to conduct the MP process, whether we continue with the 15-person MP committee or use a series of open public input meetings. If not stated in the DOI, does it mean we can use whatever format we think appropriate?	The master plan committee still exists and is described as a "Consensus Seeking Process" in the Guidelines document. We attempted to clearly describe this and other recommended public participation processes, and the role of participating residents in them.
44	General	Master Planning Committee Selection/Appointment Responsibility. It is unclear how a master planning committee will be chosen; e.g. under existing policy, master planning committee membership is developed at the staff/PRGAB level and recommended to City Council for appointment. Council appointment of this committee causes State Open Meetings Laws to apply, which helps ensure transparency and accountability.	The master plan committee still exists and is described as a "Consensus Seeking Process" in the Guidelines document. Requirements of the open meetings law will apply to these processes as they have to master plan committees.
45	General	The meeting (and focus of the three documents) is about "public participation" in the Parks and Recreation Department, not just the master planning process.	Agreed
46	General	Renovations and other CIP projects should be at recommendation for Director to choose when and type of public participation to use (of course after screening with the new tool to help staff choose)	Agreed
47	General	How can park elements be decoupled from the Master Planning process? Don't all parties need to know what elements are in the plan before they can act, vote, comment, or recommend approval of the plan?	The master plan committee still exists and is described as a "Consensus Seeking Process" in the planning and public participation documents. Requirements of the open meetings law will apply to these processes as they have to master plan committees.
48	General	The main section of the Guidelines and the Public Participation Policy are an excellent starting point, but the Departmental Operating Instructions (DOI) are unacceptable. Too much of the existing park master planning policy has been thrown out, even though the consultant (NRLI) did not determine that this Resolution process was a problem; <u>it was the implementation and management of this that caused the problems.</u> Therefore, the Resolution should serve as the foundation for a new Park Master Planning Policy, and a Feedback & Consultation/Community Meeting format should be added to it, along with other key recommendations of the "Involving the Public" report that will improve management and implementation of both of these processes. <u>Then, this document should be combined with the Public Participation Policy, then</u>	The Departmental Operating Instructions (DOI) document has been extensively redrafted and is now titled "Pubic Participation Manual for Park Planning." The existing park master planning policy is described in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning. The intent of the planning and public participation language contained in the "Resolution Process" has been retained and is described in the manual in the section titled, "Procedures." Note that information on public participation has been expanded considerably to include a wider variety of public participation procedures as described in the the Public Participation Guidelines.
49	General	The document states oversight will be provided by the PRGAB members but does not indicate how the PRGAB will be educated value of citizen engagement, the Public Participation Guidelines or the Park Planning Policy. Given the lack of engagement in the public meeting last month there seems to be little interest in the PRGAB to be engaged in or educated about the value of this process. Clearly the message was not conveyed that the public meeting would be of value to the PRGAB members in their service as members of a citizens advisory board.	The Department's Pubic Participation Manual for Park Planning defines a clear and significant role for the PRGAB in park and recreation planning. Planning actions will be included in the Board's annual work plans, and appropriate methods of engagement of the Board will be determined by the Parks Director and Board leadership. In addition, an introduction to the Public Participation Guidelines, the Department's Policy and Process will be included in each Board member's orientation and emphasized at the outset of individual park planning efforts.
50	General	I am disappointed that the Council's request that the Parks Board receive training on core principles of and best practices in public involvement have not taken place. Without this foundation, they will not have a good background to review these proposed documents and make recommendations. To my knowledge, they haven't even remotely recently had a presentation on the existing master planning policy. Ideally, training should take place before a Q&A session so that they will be better prepared to ask informed questions.	An introduction to the Public Participation Guidelines, the Department's Public Participation Policy and Process, will be included in each Board member's orientation and emphasized at the outset of individual park planning efforts.
51	General	PRGAB needs more training when put in leadership positions; however their roles are in their bi-laws.	An introduction to the Public Participation Guidelines, the Department's Public Participation Policy and Process, will be included in each Board member's orientation and emphasized at the outset of individual park planning efforts.
52	General	Provide presentation to the PRGAB, it would be beneficial.	Presentation to the PRGAB will be provided when adopted.
53	General	These documents should do more to provide guidance beyond that in Resolution 2003-735 regarding committee selection. The stakeholder matrix in the "Involving the Public" report should be included, as well as a sample application form covering relevant issues for those applying to serve on a master planning or consensus seeking committee.	Agreed.

**COMMENTS RELATED TO THE POLICY DOCUMENT**

54	Policy	Hope this policy is going to be refined before being sent to City Council for adoption. Observation of existing policies in action may help because this does not seem to be a realistic working document, and from my experience I think it would only make the process more prone to confusion and manipulation.	The Policy Document has undergone extensive review and revision based on public comments received.
55	Policy	Is the Parks Dept. definitely committed to following the policies developed through this process once they are finalized?	The intent of the policy document is to hold all parties, including but not limited to the Department of Parks and Recreation, accountable to the principles of public participation.
56	Policy	This document should be combined with the Park Master Planning Policy. Having them separate is confusing and they could be better integrated if they were melded into one. They should both be adopted by City Council because following them both is equally important and will ensure better accountability	The relationship between the Park Master Planning Policy and the Public Participation Policy has been made more explicit in the revised draft of the documents.
57	Policy	A note about accountability: in all of the problems citizens have experienced relative to park planning, the only accountability we have actually seen take place is at the City Council level. It is at this level where authority and accountability should be focused, because it is clear that true accountability will not happen at the staff level.	The two documents that describe the responsible entities in park planning and public participation are the Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning (formerly the DOI). Both documents clearly identify the responsibilities of City Council, City Manager, Parks Director, PRGAB, and Parks Department staff in park planning and development. City Council retains the right to require and approve a planning action for any and all park properties. Moreover, the Council retains authority in approving the selection of park planning consultants, selection of consensus committees (formerly master planning committees), and adopting final plans.
58	Policy	This policy should reference/include the International Association for Public Participation's Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation in some way so that it is clear that it is intended for these values to apply to parks related planning. <a href="http://www.iap2.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=4">http://www.iap2.org/displaycommon.cfm?an=4</a>	The International Association for Public Participation's Core Values for the Practice of Public Participation are referenced in the Public Participation Guidelines. We adapted the core values into the four processes identified in the Guidelines document.
59	Policy	This policy should also clearly articulate when a master plan is <u>not</u> needed (see Res 2003-735 page 11). For accountability and transparency purposes, clear thresholds for evaluating whether to initiate a new master plan, master plan revision, or amendment. (see p. 11 of Resolution) should be included.	The Public Participation Manual for Park Planning clearly defines in Section 4.4 when a master plan is not needed.
60	Policy	<b>1. Purpose:</b> Last sentence should strike "shall be" and "Operating" and add on the end of the sentence "for use in park planning processes and endeavors."	The last two sentences now read, "This policy document is associated with the following Parks and Recreation planning documents: Getting Involved in Raleigh Parks Planning, Raleigh Parks and Recreation Public Participation Guidelines for Park Planning, and Raleigh Parks and Recreation Public Participation Manual for Park Planning, wherein best practices, operating procedures, and roles and responsibilities for specific process formats and procedures are described. This document and the associated documents listed here replace Resolution (2003) -735, "A Resolution to Revise the Process for Approval of Master Plans for Park and Related Projects."
61	Policy	<b>1. Purpose:</b> The last sentence "This policy document should be accompanied by... Operating Guidelines..." does not make sense. If this document is to be accompanied by another - shouldn't they be combined and adopted together?	The words "accompanied by" have been replaced with "associated with."
62	Policy	<b>2. (a).</b> replace the Seattle language from which this was taken: use the term "encourage" instead of organize opportunities for" – this gives a better, more positive impression of genuine interest in public involvement.	We believe the existing language "organize opportunities for" conveys a more active and accountable approach by Parks and Recreation staff than does the word "encourage."
63	Policy	<b>2.(a).</b> Somehow the public should be able to review and comment on the Parks Director's judgment that a project would not substantially modify a park's use or appearance.	Although the Parks Director initiates a request to the City Council for a planning action, recommendation to include a planning action in the Capital Improvement Program, staff or Park Board work plan may come from a variety of sources including City Council, citizen request or petition, the Parks and Recreation Department or the PRGAB
64	Policy	<b>2.(a)</b> Should this major decision be left up to only one person's opinion? Does the public have any knowledge of these decisions, or opportunity to object to these decisions?	Although the Parks Director initiates a request to the City Council for a planning action, recommendation to include a planning action in the Capital Improvement Program, staff or Park Board work plan may come from a variety of sources including City Council, citizen request or petition, the Parks and Recreation Department or the PRGAB
65	Policy	<b>2. (c).</b> return to something more similar to Seattle language, i.e. be specific that staff and others who conduct public meetings be well trained in meeting facilitation.	Department staff and consultants can fill many roles for effective public participation beyond that of facilitator. They are also conveners, process leaders, and resource experts, all of which require sufficient skill and knowledge to make public participation processes meaningful and effective. Moreover, Section 2(d) calls for the Department to follow best practices in public participation, which describes the necessary skills and actions of Departmental staff and consultants. Therefore we don't see the need to make this change.
69	Policy	<b>2.(d).</b> remove the word "operational"	Done.
67	Policy	<b>2.(e)</b> What is "early and thorough notification"?	Notification requirements are contained in Section 7 of the Policy Document and in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning (formerly the DOI).
68	Policy	<b>2.(f)</b> How is this done? example?	Methods of informing the public of planning decisions will likely vary from project to project. How this will be accomplished will be included in the communication plan that is developed for each project
69	Policy	<b>2.(h)</b> This is unclear - what do the second and third reasons mean? Can you add "to include but not limited to" to make this clear?	Information about activities exempt from the policy has been moved to Section 9. We included some additional explanatory language.
70	Policy	<b>2. (h).</b> provide examples of what this might include and why this statement is here	Information about activities exempt from the policy has been moved to Section 9. We included some additional explanatory language.

71	Policy	2. Add: replace the Seattle statement #5: "When possible, to invite the community's ideas, e.g. for a park design or a site for a new activity, rather than to present a list of options or a proposed design."	The suggested language refers to the application of a specific methodology. While we agree that this procedure is good public participation practice, this and other methods are fully described in the Guidelines document. Section 2(d) makes it a policy of the Department to follow best practices as defined in the Guidelines document.
72	Policy	2 (d), what document are you referring to? It's unclear if this is referring to the guidelines or the operating instructions. It's a hybrid title. This lack of clarity doesn't help accountability	The updated draft lists the associated documents by the new and correct titles.
73	Policy	3. Public Participation Principles. Add an additional statement under Process Design: "Evaluate to learn from experience and improve in future."	This is covered in Section 2(g).
74	Policy	3. Title: "Core" Public Participation Principles?	The title of this section is "Public Participation Principles."
75	Policy	3.(a) "Strive"? Can this be measured, and if so how?	We removed the word "strive." Methods for enhancing broader participation in park planning activities is contained in the Public Participation Guidelines document.
76	Policy	3.(c) How is this done?	Methods for increasing the transparency of planning processes is contained in the Public Participation Guidelines document.
77	Policy	3.(d) What does this mean? It makes no sense to me.	This pertains to the timing of public processes in relation to actions taken by staff, PRGAB, and City Council.
78	Policy	3.(e) Promote Full Participation. The process <del>should</del> shall ["should" seems to be an option; "shall" is an imperative] be managed to give all involved a fair voice so as to benefit from differences in perspectives, approaches, backgrounds, and cultures [I recommend that all statements use active voice verbs. So instead of stating "The process should be managed . . ." state something like The Department shall manage the process in order to give all interested parties and individuals no matter perspective, approach, background or culture an opportunity to express their point of view	We replaced "should" with "shall" in the policy document. We also edited the document and replaced passive verbs with active verbs where grammatically appropriate.
79	Policy	3.(f) Promote Mutual Understanding. <del>Citizens should come away from public participation processes with a greater understanding and appreciation of the perspective of other citizens and the Department [the previous sentence describes what the citizens "should" do, but the topic of the principle is to "promote mutual understanding" which is the department's assignment. The question is what will the department do to effect mutual understanding, not how the citizens will respond? I recommend that the topic sentence be changed to clearly state the department's assignment] Participants should have the opportunity to accept one another's needs and goals and legitimate</del> <del>—[what does the previous sentence mean? I recommend deleting it] This Public Participation Policy 3 requires time and a process that allows people to freely exchange information about what is important to them.</del> <del>[What is the point of this sentence? Is it necessary? If not, I suggest it be deleted. If it is necessary, then it ought to be rewritten and its point made</del>	We changed this statement to read, "The Department shall manage processes so that residents derive a greater understanding and appreciation of the perspective of other residents and the Department, and accept one another's needs and goals as legitimate. This requires a process that allows people to freely exchange information about what is important to them."
80	Policy	3.(f) Doesn't this also affect elected officials - City Council?	Although this principle is mostly directed at how the Department will involve Raleigh residents and others with an interest in Raleigh Parks and Recreation, by extension, it pertains to all residents, including elected officials
81	Policy	3.(f). should it be "as" legitimate?	Agreed.
82	Policy	3.(g) Strive for Inclusive Solutions. <del>Participation processes should be designed to avoid either/or decisions and advance opportunities to build win/win solutions [Would you not agree that there are times when exclusive solutions are preferred? For example, a nature park, i.e., Horseshoe Farm does not lend itself to crowds engaged in or attending robust athletic activities in lighted courts or large buildings Not every situation is the same; some call for exclusive solutions, others for inclusive. I also would delete the expressions "either/or" and "win/win" for more precise language. Finally, I recommend that the principle statement be changed to "Strive for the Most Appropriate Solution that May Serve Several Different Interests" or words to that effect] The key to building integrative outcomes is to provide the means for people to make their interests known and understood. [Is not this point obvious? What is unclear is who will do the providing? I recommend this sentence be rewritten to clarify what the purpose is and who has the</del>	The term "inclusive solutions" means solutions that meet the interests of all members of the participating public in such a way that can be accommodated given constraints such as budget, physical site limitations, etc. This statement has been rewritten to more clearly make this point.
83	Policy	3.(h) Share Responsibility for Decisions. Citizens <del>should</del> shall share in the responsibility for park planning decisions. <del>by being able to weigh in on choices that are important to them. [delete] Responsibility goes both ways. [Is this necessary? If not, delete] Sharing decision responsibility obligates citizens to find solutions to shared problems rather than simply fighting against alternatives they dislike. [As written citizens "should . . . weigh in on choices that are important to them . . . yet find solutions to shared problems rather than simply fighting against them." There is a potential contradiction of purposes here. Why should citizens be obligated to find a solution for an activity they strongly oppose? For example, surrounding neighbors may oppose inclusion of facilities for dogs and dog owners. Should they feel obligated to provide a solution for those who seek such facilities? I recommend that (h) be rewritten to point out clearly what citizen responsibilities are in this context. Example: Citizens shall share in the responsibility for park planning and with appropriate staff s</del>	We replaced "should" with "shall" in the policy document. We also edited the document and replaced passive verbs with active verbs where grammatically appropriate.

84	Policy	<b>3(e)-(h).</b> Add an additional statement under Process Management: Use neutral facilitators skilled in facilitation, conflict management and collaborative decision making.	While it is agreed that a skilled, neutral facilitator can certainly help the Department to abide by the principles described in this section, a facilitator may not be necessary for successful management of all public participation processes which the Department may organize. Including a statement about the use of a facilitator in this section implies that a facilitator should be used in all such situations, a standard which we do not feel is wise or necessary. It may be prudent to amend the Guidelines document to include decision criteria on when to use a skilled, neutral facilitator in public participation processes.
85	Policy	<b>3.(i)-(k).</b> Add to title "Principles in Information Integration <u>and Communication.</u> " A very important part of public participation is giving the public the information they need to be well informed and offer good suggestions. This has been a problem in the past. This section should explicitly state that the City will maintain and provide full information and make this information accessible throughout the planning process on the project webpage. Information will provided in plenty of time for it to be useful to citizens.	Although we kept the heading title the same in the updated draft, we add language that states, "The Department shall make information that is relevant to park and recreation planning accessible to all residents who wish to access it as allowed by public records laws and consistent with City of Raleigh policies."
86	Policy	<b>3.(i)-(k).</b> the Department should collect a database of contact information (including name, address, email address) for participants who either come to meetings or submit written comments re: a project/planning effort and this list of people will receive project email updates and progress reports and meeting notices.	The Department Pubic Participation Manual for Park Planning contains the following language in the Procedures Section (Sector 6): "Collecting contact information and feedback at the initial public meeting is an essential role for DD staff, other support staff, and/or the consultant. residents will be able to register to receive future communications regarding the project, including notices of additional meetings, availability of information for review and comment, and final disposition of the project. "
87	Policy	<b>3.(i) Ensure Transparency of Information and Analysis.</b> Information and analyses <del>should</del> shall be accessible and understandable to all participants. <del>Be explicit about assumptions and uncertainties. [to whom does this sentence apply? Who is responsible to be explicit? I recommend rewriting this statement in the active voice so that it is clear who has the responsibility to make information and analyses transparent and available to the public]</del>	This has been rewritten to read, "The Department shall make Information and analyses accessible and understandable to all participants. Assumptions and uncertainties about information made available by the Department shall be made explicit."
88	Policy	<b>3.(j)</b> ...what they will do with it? Why is this a consideration for information needs of the public?	This has been rewritten to read, "The Department shall design and manage public participation processes that provide opportunities for residents to define the information they need."
89	Policy	<b>3.(j).</b> This is an odd statement. Why do citizens need to say what they will do with information? This is against public information laws. This statement should make clear that if citizens ask for information, it will be provided.	This has been rewritten to read, "The Department shall design and manage public participation processes that provide opportunities for residents to define the information they need."
90	Policy	<b>3.(j) Anticipate Information Needs.</b> Citizens <del>should</del> shall have opportunities to <del>define</del> obtain the information they need, <del>and determine</del> when they need it, <del>and what they will do with it.</del> [Why must citizens explain what they will do the information they request. I recommend deleting this statement] <del>Anticipate and help organize information provision and dissemination. [who is to do the anticipating and organizing? Citizens or the departmental staff? I think this sentence needs to be rewritten]</del>	This has been rewritten to read, "The Department shall design and manage public participation processes that provide opportunities for residents to define the information they need."
91	Policy	<b>3.(k) Pay Attention to Both Facts and Values.</b> <del>Provide information and deliberation processes to allow citizens to evaluate trade offs among things they value. [I suggest first that the subject of the sentence be made explicit, i.e., the department staff. Secondly, I find this sentence so vague and ambiguous that it reads more like filler material than an expression of a clear policy. For example, what does to "evaluate trade offs among things they value" mean?]</del>	This language has been removed from the latest draft.
92	Policy	<b>4.</b> Shouldn't the process of reaching consensus on these documents model the core principles you're advocating? If so, where does developing a public involvement policy fall under section 4 on page 3 of the policy? Can you more specifically include it in this list? And how will you model this as we go forward – will there be a consensus seeking committee?	The Department engaged in an active and thorough public participation process in the review and adoption of the policies and documents it is putting forward. Comments received on the first draft, have used as a guide for revising the documents. The final draft will then be forwarded to Council for additional public input and potential changes by Council prior to adoption.
93	Policy	<b>4. Activities Covered Under this Policy</b> (j) Rather than using a percentage threshold (such as 15-30% or the existing 30%) for construction drawings review, I suggest including a list of the things that construction drawings for review must include, such as placement/location and type of all elements and facilities, where appropriate the type of playground equipment or picnic shelter selected, and for those types of elements that will come from a catalogue, a photo of the recommended amenity.	The percentage figure has been removed. The statement now reads, "(b) Park and Recreation Facility Design and Development (Schematic Design)."
94	Policy	<b>4.(d).</b> When do "major renovations and redevelopment" trigger public involvement and how would the public learn about these things and have an opportunity to comment on them? This should be in the documents.	Citizens have the opportunity to review and comment on major renovation and/or redevelopment projects when they are funded through the annual CIP, which includes publishing of the proposed budget and public hearings. Projects are also funded through bond issues, which include public presentations at both the neighborhood, Park Board and City Council levels. In addition when projects are being planned, if it is apparent the public will be impacted public participation includes outreach (at a minimum) to neighborhoods through CAC meetings, signs at facilities, and possibly public meetings held expressly for the purpose of outreach and information exchange.
95	Policy	<b>4.(g).</b> This item should be broadened to include any citywide policy making effort, such as the Comprehensive Plan or a Public Involvement Policy or Park Master Planning Policy. (This current policy development process should model the principles and processes recommended.)	The activities listed in this section are those that are controlled by the Parks and Recreation Department.

96	Policy	<b>5. People Affected by the Policy</b> This list should include the public at large and City Council.	City Council is responsible for approving and providing oversight to this policy. It is not useful to include 'people at large,' since such an undefined audience cannot be identified and included in public participation activities. It was intended that the stakeholders listed in items (a) through (f) would encompass the universe of Parks and Recreation stakeholders.
97	Policy	<b>6. Do citizens not have a role or responsibilities?</b>	Yes. Roles and responsibilities for residents are specified in the updated draft of the policy document.
98	Policy	<b>6. People really benefit from knowing their role in the parks planning process. The public isn't included under the Roles and Responsibilities section of the Policy. Would you please include the public in this section so they understand their part and know what to expect?</b>	The roles and responsibilities of Raleigh residents are clearly identified in the updated draft of the policy document
99	Policy	<b>6. Roles and Responsibilities. A. 1).</b> should be <u>recommends</u> committee members – this has been a problem in the past and the authority/responsibility for this should be with City Council. By having Council appoint the committee it also kicks in Open Meetings Laws requirements, which is important for transparency. (Staff has broken these laws in the past.) Having watched carefully almost every master planning committee since passage of Resolution 2003-735, I do not think that there has been as much problem as staff professes with Council making these appointments, and the benefits far outweigh the potential problems.	The updated draft of the policy document states, "The PRGAB, after review of the assessment information, including a stakeholder matrix, gathered by Department staff, recommends membership and composition of the Consensus Committee to the City Council for appointment."
100	Policy	<b>6.</b> Note somewhere it should be made clear that this <u>process design proposal</u> should be up for review and comment by the public at large and that the public has a role in having input on this.	The Department engaged in an active and thorough public participation process in the review and adoption of the policies and documents it is putting forward. Comments received on the first draft, have used as a guide for revising the documents. The final draft will then be forwarded to Council for additional public input and potential changes by Council prior to adoption.
101	Policy	<b>6.A.</b> Is there a role for the Parks Board in master planning committees? Should a role for the Board relative to SIPs be mentioned here?	The role and responsibilities of the PRGAB is clearly articulated in the updated draft of the policy document. In addition, the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning clearly specifies the responsibilities of the PRGAB in each of the planning activities <u>identified in the policy document.</u>
102	Policy	<b>6.A.2)</b> Primary: City Council should also be the final approver of the process design for accountability and transparency.	City council is responsible for approving the scope as part of contract approvals. City Manager is responsible for ensuring that Council's interests are reflected in the process design and implementation. City Manager has the option of updating appropriate <u>Councilor(s) or Council on the process design or implementation is concerns exist</u>
103	Policy	<b>6.B.</b> PGRAB members are often political appointees with little park planning experience. They should have limited influence on public processes, process designs, and planning outcomes. From personal experience with the Raleigh PGRAB, they blatantly disregarded clear public sentiment and input in favor of personal and political agendas. They also appear to be prone to making decisions based on park staff pressure and manipulation. Reference the following example: <a href="http://www.indyweek.com/gyrobase/Content?oid=oid:34762">www.indyweek.com/gyrobase/Content?oid=oid:34762</a>	As appointees of City Council, PRGAB members are appointed by City Council and serve as the official citizen advisory board to the Council on issues related to parks, greenway and recreation policy matters. The Board serves as a liaison between the City and the residents of the community.
104	Policy	<b>6.C.</b> The Council is elected, the manager is hired - they have different roles. They each should have clear roles and responsibilities.	The responsibilities of the City Council and City Manager are separately defined in the updated draft.
105	Policy	<b>6.C.</b> The City Manager's responsibilities are staff/administration related and his role should be in A with other staff. This section should be only for City Council, since they are the elected officials/policy makers. So: one <u>section for Administration, one for City Council.</u>	The responsibilities of the City Council and City Manager are separately defined in the updated draft.
106	Policy	<b>6.C.</b> Add 3) "Review and final approval of participants in Consensus Seeking process committees, consistent with Public Participation Guidelines.	The updated draft of the policy document states, "The PRGAB, after review of the assessment information, including a stakeholder matrix, gathered by Department staff, recommends membership and composition of the Consensus Committee to the City Council for appointment."
107	Policy	<b>7.A.</b> What are examples or definitions of formats, media, and time frames? this is vague	The updated draft of the policy document provides clear examples of notification formats, media and time frames.
108	Policy	<b>7.B.</b> What happens to this comment? How is it incorporated?	The public's input will guide the planning and development process. Specific applications of public input will vary depending on the type planning action (Park Master Planning, System Integration Plan, etc.) and the context in which input is provided. The Public Participation Manual for Park Planning identifies how public comment will be incorporated into planning decisions.
109	Policy	<b>7. Notificationa and Public Comment.</b> Note: this section is redundant if you combine the DOI with this policy. You could do it once and do it well, covering all scenarios of where notification applies and what type of notification and how long is appropriate for each.	Because the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning (formerly the DOI) is not a document adopted by the Council, we believe that this section should remain in the Policy document. We agree that the notification and public comment information <u>in the DOI should be more clearly specified.</u>
110	Policy	<b>7.A.</b> This provides no minimum time period, is discretionary, and is inadequate to ensure appropriate notification. Delete "to the maximum extent possible" as this could mean 24 hours. Insert a minimum time period for different types of notifications.	The updated draft of the policy document stipulates notification periods and procedures. In addition, the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning provide further detail on departmental procedures for public notification.
111	Policy	<b>7.B.</b> This provides no accommodation for written comments, and in practice could amount to only a formal public hearing. This is not enough to ensure good quality involvement.	Agreed. The updated draft now reads, "All opportunities for public participation organized by the Parks and Recreation Department for planning, design, development, renovation and other proposed projects identified in Section 4 must include opportunities for open public comment at a public forum where residents may attend in person and by written comment.."
112	Policy	<b>8. Activities Exempt:</b> please provide specific examples of what these might be.	Examples of proposals or projects undertaken for legal or safety reasons have been provided.

113	Policy	8. To consider potentially exempt from this policy proposals or projects undertaken for legal or safety reasons, proposals for which the public process is spelled out elsewhere by ordinance or by policy, or events protected by the First Amendment of the U.S. Constitution. <b>The Department recognizes that public outreach and input may substantially increase the effectiveness of a project . [I would like to see the previous sentence—I made it bold print--be located at the beginning of this document. I think it states what the concerned public yearns to read and believe about this process]</b>	The updated draft now reads, "While the Department recognizes that public participation may substantially increase the effectiveness of a project, some activities may be exempt from this policy. The following actions or activities undertaken by the Parks and Recreation Department may be exempt from this policy..."
114	Policy	8. Again this is vague, open-ended, and suspicious looking from the public perspective	In some cases, public involvement in parks and recreation planning decisions may not be appropriate. These cases, although rare, must be identified in the policy document. The updated draft has made these exceptions more clear and explicit.
115	Policy	9. The public can not comment on something that isn't here. The public should have an opportunity to comment on this document once it is complete and revised.	Notice of a public meeting and post-meeting comment period are planned as documents are published and publicized on the web sites.
116	Policy	10. This Glossary section seems to be mixing definitions of things with articulating when they are required. Both are important, but they should be separate in the document. This policy should in a different section very clearly articulate the scenarios under which a new master plan, a master plan revision, or a master plan amendment should be initiated and how the public will be informed and have a chance to comment on this proposal in advance.	The glossary in the updated draft has been revised. It now contains terms that are relevant to planning and public participation.
117	Policy	10.A. Should be complete and use the definition of a master plan from Res 2003-735 and also all required elements of a master plan (program statement, written description of the intent of the master plan concept proposed, priorities for phased development of the project, conceptual drawing, environmental stewardship recommendations, link to other adopted master plans). There is inconsistency in these documents re: what a master plan (draft, proposed, and final) should include. All of the above should apply to each of these.	The purpose of the glossary is to define the terms used in the policy document. More complete descriptions of planning terms is contained in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning.
118	Policy	10.B. This politicizes park master planning to a high degree and should be deleted. How would a Council objectively determine that a park master plan is no longer "supported by the community as a whole"? The language in Res 2003-735 has not been problematic and should be retained. (see pp. 10-11)	community support for a master plan is subjective and we believe it will be apparent to both elected officials and Department staff. Revision of a master plan is not taken lightly since it is a serious commitment of resources and funding may not have been planned years in advance as it typically the accepted process.
119	Policy	10. C. Master plan amendments may not necessarily be additions. The language here is unclear and could be very subjectively determined. Res 2003-735's is better: A master plan amendment is "when a new specific use not included in the adopted master plan is to be considered for the park or a specific change for the park is proposed that does not significantly alter other uses of the park."	Proposed new definition, included in the Jan 2012 Drafts: "A new use or arrangement of uses that differs from the adopted master plan can be considered for the park that complements, contributes to and does not detract from the Program Statement (vision, elements) of the park."
120	Policy	10.D. This definition of an SIP should say "includes a" instead of "begins a process of complete" site inventory and "interim" should be defined as between completion of the SIP and development of the park.	inventory may very well be a dynamic, on going task that needs updating as a useful management tool. Will propose additional language to the effect that an adopted Master Plan in implemented.
121	Policy	10.E. I don't understand why we now have a new category called "Major Renovation and Redevelopment" - it seems like this would fall under the category of a scenario when a master plan or a master plan revision would be needed. Therefore, isn't it redundant to include it?	Renovation definition is not redundant if the renovation and/or redevelopment is consistent with the Master Plan. Improvements of this nature can benefit from various levels of public participation commensurate with the scope and scale of the work.
122	Policy	<b>General Comment:</b> Moving the Public Participation Process Selection Guide from the Guidelines to this document would be preferable and beneficial. This would help streamline the documents and reduce redundancy. This guide is something that should be followed, therefore it should be adopted by Council for accountability purposes.	The flow chart that accompanies the policy document lists the public participation processes described in the Guidelines, and refers to the Process Selection Guide as the means of selecting appropriate processes.
123	Policy	I like the questions in Attachment A of the Seattle policy and think it would be good to include some of those in the determination of the scope of the public process and the process design proposal. The process design proposal should clearly show the judgments that were made relative to the Process Selection Guide, to promote transparency and accountability.	
<b>COMMENTS RELATED TO THE PUBLIC PARTICIPATION GUIDELINES</b>			
124	Guidelines	This document in general provides good advice for staff and can act as an educational and reference tool for the staff, the PRGAB and the public.	That is its intent.
125	Guidelines	The Public Participation Guidelines provide a useful workbook for those who are interested in being involved in park planning: interested citizens, PRGAB members and staff - current and future. The document clearly outlines how to 'play fair' and how to show respect for citizens and build meaningful communication.	That is its intent.
126	Guidelines	Is "feedback and consultation" the same as a core team format and community meeting process? Is "consensus seeking" the same as a park master planning committee?	More or less. We deliberately avoided those terms so that we could describe public participation processes more generically.

127	Guidelines	The entire process development experience (selection and design) is very unclear, especially with respect to the public's right to review and comment on the type of process proposed to be used. On one hand, it appears that stakeholders and neutral facilitators should have a role in helping to design the process. On the other hand, this is not built into the guidelines to give guidance about how this can happen. As these 3 documents are drafted, process determination and design is a critical step, yet there is little to no transparency or accountability built into this aspect. Whatever document is adopted by Council should be clear about what information the public and City Council should be given outlining the proposed process and how it will all happen. The following things should be included for public review and comment and City Council approval: Situation assessment Goals of the planning process Selection guide judgments and outcomes How outreach will take place Process map How will proposed design process/plan be advertised? Steps such as those under Techniques for Consensus Seeking Processes on page 18, e.g. how will stakeholder Expected timeline Will staff or neutral facilitator be employed as facilitator?	Process development is outlined in a step-format in the <b>Guidelines</b> . Responsibility is assigned in the <b>Policy</b> . Detailed outline of process development and implementation is spelled out in the <b>Manual</b> . Once Department staff have identified the appropriate public participation process for a given planning activity, the PRGAB will review and provide comment. Summary reasons for design process decisions will be provided as part of contract award (scope and fees) to Council; As initial process design is evaluated and adjusted during Pre-deliberation (Consensus Seeking), stakeholders will be involved in process adjustment, potentially including consultant contract amendments (different facilitation, venues, additional stakeholders and/or meetings, for instance).
128	Guidelines	It would be helpful to have a glossary at the end of this document that defines terms that may be unfamiliar to some people and help with interpretation of this document, such as: participants, stakeholders, process map, process design, negotiating team, conference format, bounded v. unbounded, accountability standards (p. 18).	Glossary is provided in the three documents.
129	Guidelines	It would be great to include in this document the stakeholder matrix that you included in your previous report so that it will be used for process design.	agree
130	Guidelines	All participants in planning processes, whether a committee member or citizen attending a meeting, should be considered "participants" for the purposes of this document, and should receive progress reports and updates, meeting notices, etc. via email.	agree
131	Guidelines	Are you recommending that a situation assessment be done for each consensus process? Each master planning process? Feedback and consultation? All master planning is potentially contentious.	yes
132	Guidelines	Page 1, last paragraph: the intent of best practices should also be to ensure that parks are more responsive to the needs and desires of citizens whom they serve.	agree
133	Guidelines	Page 6, item 3 under Best Practices: It would help if you would outline what a strategic communication plan should include.	General content of a communication plan has been added to the Manual. Section 7.2.4 and extensive notification details, Section 7.3
134	Guidelines	Page 7, item 5: It would help if this process map were available on the project webpage.	agree
135	Guidelines	Page 7, item 6: Suggest revising as follows: Time the message so that the public has adequate and reasonable opportunities to act on it.	agree
136	Guidelines	Page 9, item 5: How are under-represented audiences determined?	Under represented audiences are defined as the gap between the demographics of the audiences that have attended past public participation events and activities in or near the planning area, and the known demographics of the planning area.
137	Guidelines	Page 13, item 8: similar to that above, put process map on webpage for reference.	Agreed.
138	Guidelines	Page 13, item 10: refer to Appendix B.	Agreed.
139	Guidelines	P. 13, item 15: add "or where staff may be perceived as biased or lacking objectivity.	Will change item 15 to read: "Use a neutral facilitator in situations where the issues are complex and potentially divisive, or where there is a perceived level of conflict and mistrust among various publics and between the public and City of Raleigh staff.
140	Guidelines	P. 14, second paragraph, fifth line revise as follows: "to promote audience interaction and involvement (multiway..."	Agreed.
141	Guidelines	P. 17, item 1c: This form should be for stakeholder representatives or interested individuals, not just stakeholder groups, and it would be helpful to include as an Appendix an example form with background advice.	Will strike the word "group" from 1.c. Will include the form as an appendix.
142	Guidelines	P. 17, item 2e: what does this mean, what are the limits of this?	We will reword the statement to read, "Be prepared to provide additional organizational or technical assistance to who need it to participate." This statement can mean providing non-english translation of key materials, or providing additional means of staff interaction. The limits are defined by Departmental resources and budget.
143	Guidelines	P. 17, item 3: Ground rules should define how the committee will receive information from the public.	We will add another item to the list that reads: "Define how information will be shared among participants, the Department, and the public."
144	Guidelines	P. 18, item 5b: what are "accountability standards", please define.	Changed language to read: "Ensure evaluations occur on a regular basis"
145	Guidelines	P. 18, item 6: Add to end of lead sentence, "not be overly prescriptive, but should ensure transparency and accountability".	We will reword the statement to read, "While policies governing these processes should ensure inclusiveness, transparency and accountability, they should not be overly prescriptive."

146	Guidelines	Techniques section on page 18: These steps are very helpful, but it would be even better if it were clarified <u>who should be responsible for each</u> . It would be helpful to provide an example of what all this would look like for a park master planning effort (Community Park) in an Appendix.	Assigning responsibility for these many steps is not a one-size-fits-all approach and will vary by project/process. In general, either Design Development staff or facilitator has immediate responsibility for most of these techniques. Ultimate responsibility is laid out in the Policy.
147	Guidelines	Place a heading "STAGE ONE" before item 1.	Will add "STAGE ONE: PRE-DELIBERATION"
148	Guidelines	Item 1:What are "conditions for collaboration"?	These are defined in Appendix A: Conducting a Situation Assessment
149	Guidelines	Item 3, page 19, bullet 2: refer to Selection Guide, pages 22-26.	Will do.
150	Guidelines	Item 4: Define negotiating team, conference format, and describe the circumstances under which these would be appropriate.	These terms are not applicable and will be stricken.
151	Guidelines	Place a heading "STAGE TWO" after item 5.	Will add "STAGE TWO: DELIBERATION"
152	Guidelines	Item 7: add "Provide all relevant background information"	Will add: "Identify and share relevant background information."
153	Guidelines	P. 20, item 12: delete "whether it meets desired future" and add "Consistency with previously adopted plans and policies"	Will add the words "for example:" above the bulleted items; will strike first bulleted item; will add "consistency with plans and policies."
154	Guidelines	Place a heading "STAGE THREE" after item 15.	Will add: "STAGE THREE: POST-DELIBERATION"
155	Guidelines	<b>Selection Guide, page 22, item 7:</b> Any public involvement policy should cover the development of documents like these. Therefore, this item should be expanded to include developing a Public Involvement Policy or Park Master Planning Policy; I suggest revising as follows: "Broad, citywide policy development and planning including but not limited to Comprehensive Park System Planning policies, Public Involvement and Park Master Planning policies	Policy development at a City-wide level is at the direction of Council and is beyond the scope of "park planning", which these Guidelines/Policy/Manual documents address. Best practices are being employed in this policy development, but are not being suggested as a course for other City policy endeavors.
156	Guidelines	<b>Process Selection Guide.</b> Public Participation Guidelines – pg 22, top paragraph, change the reference for the scale to pg. 25-26	References to page numbers have been removed.
157	Guidelines	<b>Process Selection Guide.</b> Scoring, identifying and recommending the process to follow should be a staff completed task with the recommendation going to the Director/City Manager. If there is a difference of opinion on the process to use it should be reviewed by PRGAB	This is a staff task under approval of the Director/City Manager. PRGAB is advisory body only.
158	Guidelines	<b>Process Selection Guide.</b> What are the specific requirements for notifying the public about proposals that are being made re: process selection and design – and how can the public have access to the completed process selection guide and comment on this? Where is this written in the documents?	Process is a staff/consultant task (see comment #164 and response). Council approves scope of work and process to be used in a planning activity. Scope is included in Council backup for contract approvals. This area of consultant selection is public information once it is provided to the City Council. During Pre-deliberation the process will be examined and adjusted (if necessary) with stakeholders involvement
159	Guidelines	Would the public be able to attend a feedback and consultation core team meeting? How can this be built into the documents to promote better transparency?	Core Team or Public Leadership Group meetings will be publicized per these documents.
160	Guidelines	Page 23, last line of paragraph at top: "outreach" goal may be misunderstood here, because outreach is also a title of a type of process; suggest "involvement"	Agreed.
161	Guidelines	Recommend changing the Total Group 1 Score to less than 12 for Information Exchange.	A score of 13 allows all four Group 1 criteria to be scored at their mid-range score of 3 and remain in the information exchange category. Group 1 criteria describe scale of park planning and development activity as are less critical than Group 2 criteria. As long as no Group 2 score exceeds level 2, and the goals of the planning process are specifically tied to information exchange, then a score of less than 13 on Group 1 criteria should be sufficiently low to accommodate an Information Exchange process.
162	Guidelines	Recommend adding Total Group 1 Score of 4 and "or greater" after "Group 2 Score is a 3" for Feedback and Consultation.	The same reasoning with respect to Group 1 scores is applicable here as in the responses to comment #82. A total Group 1 score of 12 or less is sufficient for a Feedback and Consultation Process to be workable. We believe that the statement "The Highest Group 2 Score is 2" is sufficiently clear.
163	Guidelines	Recommend adding "or greater" after "Total Group 1 Score of (suggest 4 here)" and "or greater" after "Group 2 Score is a 4" for Consensus Seeking.	The same reasoning with respect to Group 1 scores is applicable here as in the responses to comment #82. We believe that the scoring description is clearly specified as is (the term "or greater" is present).
164	Guidelines	Page 25-26: The answers to some of these questions are totally subjective, a good reason why the public should have access to review and comment on these answers prior to the process being approved by Council.	We agree with the principle that the rationale for choosing one process over another should be open to scrutiny by the public. The process selection guide is intended to yield a PRELIMINARY RECOMMENDATION on process selection, which is necessary for assignment of resources, consultant selection and scope/contract negotiation. In some cases this is internal procedure and thus a staff task, but once process (and/or consultant) recommendations are forwarded to Council this is public information. In order to promote transparency and a clear understanding by the public and staff, discussions with stakeholders must be conducted as part of the Situation Assessment.
165	Guidelines	P. 26, item H: to be more complete, this spectrum should be between a "High degree of trust" and "Little or no trust."	Agreed.
166	Guidelines	P. 35: include your Stakeholder Matrix from the "Involving the Public" report with this section to assist with identification of potential stakeholders.	Agreed.
167	Guidelines	P. 39, bullet 7: allow interviewee to review and approve a summary of their interview to ensure accuracy.	Agreed.
168	Guidelines	P. 40: add how a chair and vice chair shall be determined.	We will review the process to determine the appropriate role of chair and vice chair and how those positions will be determined.

169	Guidelines	<b>Charter. P. 42:</b> I really appreciate that you provided a sample of what a Master Planning Committee charter might look like. Much of what is here should be included in the DOI, though, and not here. Most of this has been stripped out of the master planning policy and it should remain part of that document and then just <u>referenced here by section. This is VERY important.</u>	We agree that this information should be included but have outlined the example in the <b>Guidelines</b> and included it by reference in the <b>Manual</b> to avoid duplication.
170	Guidelines	Who chairs a consensus seeking committee?	We will review the process to determine the appropriate role of chair and vice chair and how those positions will be determined.
171	Guidelines	<b>Charter. P.41, 3. Purpose. Paragraph 1:</b> Planning Committees have always provided <u>recommendations to CITY COUNCIL via the PRGAB</u> and this should not change, since City Council is the policy making body and the <u>one who will ultimately adopt a plan. (see #5 below)</u>	Recommendation is to the PRGAB, which in turn makes a recommendation to Council.
172	Guidelines	P.41, 3. Purpose. Paragraph : it appears that this language was taken from another document about another subject and this section should be revised.	We believe that this paragraph is relevant to the purpose and should remain.
173	Guidelines	Res 2003-735 made clear the required elements of a draft master plan and master plan and <u>these should not change:</u> a program statement, a conceptual plan rendering, a written description of the intent of the master plan concept proposed, recommendations for environmental stewardship, priorities for phased development of the project. Again all this information should be in the DOI, based on Res 2003-735, and just referenced <u>here</u>	Listed in detail in the <b>Manual</b> .
174	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 4.A.</b> Last sentence, p. 42: The committee should have a chance to massage alternatives presented and develop their own, perhaps middle ground, instead of being forced to accept one of the plan alternatives as is.	We will change this sentence to reflect this sentiment.
175	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 4.D.</b> The “Draft Master Plan” should be made available for review and public comment <u>in accordance with (add citation/reference.)</u>	Will reference to information in the <b>Manual</b> .
176	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 4. D.</b> I like that you have called the initial a “Draft” and the one that will go to the PRGAB and Council a “Proposed”. This is a good change and it would be good to follow this through into the DOI.	Agreed.
177	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 5.</b> I have a HUGE problem with this first paragraph. Why would you give the PRGAB the authority to summarily reject the work product of a consensus seeking committee who has labored for months and maybe even years on a project? Who would want to be on a committee like that? There is no precedent for this. The PRGAB should provide their comments and recommendations to City Council, transmitted ALONG WITH the Proposed Plan developed in committee. The PRGAB would not have the benefit of the many long hours of study and deliberation that took place at the committee level. They should not be able to overthrow the work of any committee. All committee proposals should be transmitted to City Council <u>without</u> changes by the PRGAB. The DOI should spell this out in detail for fairness, accountability and transparency purposes.	Our description of the process creates a multi-tiered process where the recommendations of the planning committee are forwarded to the PRGAB. The PRGAB may concur with the committee, or not. Both the committee's and the PRGAB's recommendations are sent to the Council for approval. This has historically always occurred in Raleigh park planning efforts. This takes the Council out of the committee selection process. Our view is that this will serve to de-politicize the planning committee, and increase the probability that the committee is comprised of stakeholders relevant to the issue, rather than political appointees who may or may not be relevant.
178	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 6.C.</b> Again, all this (the entire #6 section) should be spelled out in the DOI and just referenced here. It should be made clear that just one of the stakeholder group representatives (primary/alternate) get to sit at the table and they have one vote.	We agree that this information could be included in the Manual but recommend relying on the Example charter in the Guidelines to avoid duplication. We will clarify the roles of the primary/alternate members in the decision-making process.
179	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 9.</b> Deliberating: this section should spell out what would happen if the group can not reach consensus. There should also be something added about listening to the public, since that is a responsibility of the group, including when comments will be taken at meetings and how long people will be allowed to speak unless special permission is granted.	We will add information about actions to be taken if a group does not reach consensus. We will include information about the responsibility of committee members to listen to public comment. We will also add general guidance about how long members of the public may have to address the committee. However, we feel that the committee should choose the length of time based on factors such as number of speakers, duration of meetings, etc.
180	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 6.C. New Member Appointment:</b> The new member appointments section on page 45 should be removed. This could be a real problem in a bounded committee process	We believe that if done deliberately and transparently, new committee member appointments can be accommodated without <b>burdening the process.</b>
181	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 7.</b> This should all be built into the DOI and referenced here. This section should state that the facilitator should be experienced and skilled in facilitation and neutral.	We agree that this information should be included in the <b>Manual</b> . We believe that it is helpful to planning committee members and Department staff to also include this information in the charter example. Because this document is a guidance document, we believe that the responsibilities described in this section sufficiently restrict the Department to using a facilitator who is experienced enough to fulfill them. In addition, we provide guidance in Appendix D in selecting an appropriate facilitator.
182	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 7.</b> Is a responsibility of the facilitator to keep the public/participants informed of progress?	Yes, we will include a statement to that effect.
183	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 7, Bullet 5:</b> the facilitator should also protect the public from attack.	We will change "Committee Members" to "process participants"
184	Guidelines	P. 46, bullet 1: reach <u>agreement</u> ?	yes; edit noted.
185	Guidelines	<b>Charter Section 8.A.</b> Summaries should be posted within 10 days, not 14.	Even though this is an Example charter, 14 days is consistent with other Notification timeframes throughout these documents.
186	Guidelines	P. 48, bullet 1 under Process Ground Rules: <u>add and the public participation policy, guidelines, and DOI.</u>	Agreed.

COMMENTS RELATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OPERATING INSTRUCTIONS (DOI)			
187	DOI	It is clear that this document is based on Res 2003-735, but it concerns me that key information and provisions that protect the environment and the public have been deleted. Please start over, <i>with Res 2003-735 as the beginning point</i> , and include provisions for a Feedback and Consultation/Community Meeting process. All park master planning will follow either a Feedback Consultation or Consensus Seeking process according to the Guidelines. Do not remove anything that promotes transparency, accountability, trust, or legitimacy – instead ensure these for every step of the process, e.g. SIP, initiation of master planning process, process selection and design, etc. Please ensure that ALL of the recommendations in the “Involving the Public” report are incorporated and the document is clear and well integrated with and referenced to the Public Participation Guidelines. Remove all inconsistencies between all documents.	The Department Operating Instructions (DOI) document has been completely rewritten and is now titled, "Public Participation Manual for Park Planning." We believe that the document now clearly establishes procedures for the Parks and Recreation Department to reach a Council-adopted Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, Revised Master Plan, and System Integration Plan for undeveloped parks. It is a step-by-step manual to assist staff in any effort to inform, consult with, involve and collaborate with the public in park planning and development efforts.
188	DOI	Overall, I think this document is not dovetailed with the other documents well, and worded so <u>bureaucratically in places that you can't even tell what it means. This should all be corrected</u>	
189	DOI	It appears that the DOI is proposed as the new park master planning policy to replace Resolution 2003-735 and go along with the new public involvement policy. I think it would be clearer if this section was not called "DOI" and instead was referred to as the "Park Master Planning Policy."	
190	DOI	If I understand correctly, the instruction in the DOI should be followed in the context of the other two new documents (Public Participation Policy and Guidelines). I think having three separate documents is very confusing. I'm wondering if the Public Participation Policy and the Park Master Planning Policy can be tied together or combined in some way and both would then be adopted by City Council. This would also provide the very important added benefit of greater accountability. Either way, when finalized, the DOI/Park Master Planning Policy should be acted on by City Council so that it becomes the approved new city policy.	
191	DOI	I like the format of the document with section numbers and titles such as "Purpose" and "References." It would greatly help the readability of the document to provide titles to smaller sections where appropriate, such as "System Integration Planning." This existed in the Resolution. I will also provide these <u>recommendations below</u> .	
192	DOI	There are too many places in this document that are unclear and make it possible for the Parks Dept. not to fully implement important procedures. The type of words used to accomplish this are "whenever possible" "as appropriate" "make a concerted effort to" "strive to achieve" – expectations should be clearly outlined <u>for greater accountability and transparency</u> .	
193	DOI	Overall, this document appears to focus on the Parks Department, and hardly mentions the public and other non-City entities to be involved in park master planning. I think this does not reflect well on the Department's intentions. It also makes implementation difficult to have everything related to park master <u>planning spread out all over the three documents</u> .	
194	DOI	A glossary should be included at the end of the document, defining these and other terms: Design Resource Team (2.2), Partner agencies (4.4), Design Review Team (5.6.4)	Design Resource Team is explained in the Manual, Section 2.2 Roles and Organizations - City Resources.
195	DOI	Much of the information in the proposed Guidelines document, Sample Ground Rules/Charter Appendix, was taken from Resolution 2003-735 and revised. This information should all be returned to this park master planning policy <i>as it was originally drafted</i> and referenced in the Guidelines Appendix B. These things are more appropriate here as part of the official policy (I have provided more detail about this in my comments <u>on the Guidelines</u> .)	The Guidelines are designed to provide information about best practices in public participation. The Public Participation Manual for Park Planning contains procedural description of the planning process.
196	DOI	Somewhat related to the above, there are many things that have been left out and should be returned to this policy, such as: How does a master plan get initiated? What information should be given to the public up front (see IX. Education in Res 2003-735)? Guidance for applications to serve on master planning committees. What a draft master plan and master plan must contain (program statement, written description of the intent of the master plan concept proposed, priorities for phased development of the project, conceptual drawing, environmental stewardship recommendations, link to other adopted master plans). How does the City internal review take place in time relative to the public review?	Information about planning procedures is contained in the Public Participaiton Manual for Park Planning.
197	DOI	As mentioned above, I think the rewrite of this document should start over with Resolution 2003-735 to include Feedback and Consultation and NRLI's "Involving the Public" recommendations. I only include these <u>suggestions because we are asked to comment on what's here</u> .	The Public Participation Manual for Park Planning incorporates the information contained in Resolution 2003-735 plus other public participation processes into a fuller description of all park planning activities, not just park master planning.
198	DOI	Public notice guidelines are stated clearly in the DOI.	Although public notice guidelines were specific in the early draft of the DOI, the current draft more clearly specifies procedure <u>for public notice</u> .

199	DOI	Also, is the third document - <i>Department Operating Instructions</i> ? Is this the document that the staff will follow or is PPPPPP? Why is the staff subject to different guidelines than the ones being proposed?	The Department Operating Instructions (DOI) document has been completely rewritten and is now titled, "Public Participation Manual for Park Planning." We believe that the document now clearly establishes procedures for the Parks and Recreation Department to reach a Council-adopted Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, Revised Master Plan, and System Integration Plan for undeveloped parks. It is a step-by-step manual to assist staff in any effort to inform, consult with, involve and <del>collaborate with the public in park planning and development efforts</del>
200	DOI	The language in the DOI should be more concrete about the actions the Department will take to notify citizens and invite their engagement in park planning. The current text uses phrases like: "the level of notice <i>should be</i> commensurate ..." I would prefer 'should' to be replaced with more definite language ie: <i>will be</i> commensurate ...	Although public notice guidelines were specific in the early draft of the DOI, the current draft more clearly specifies procedure for public notice.
201	DOI	"At a minimum ..." does not convey determination to go the extra step. Please change to: The Department <i>will give</i> notice of any initiation of a planning effort 30 days prior ... Recommend dropping terms like: <i>should be</i> and change to: <b>will be</b> through out the document.	Conditional statements of intent (would and should) in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning have been changed to their unconditional form (will and shall) when describing actions that will be implemented without exception, regardless of context or circumstance. Where actions are indeed conditional, the verb forms 'would' and 'should' are retained. For example, the service radius of a particular type of park serves as a guideline for who will receive notification of a planning action. However, considerations for distribution of notices will take into account the barriers to participation at a planned facility once development occurs, such as major highways or rail lines. In some cases the distance from a neighborhood park may need to be adjusted (increased, decreased) to ensure adequate notice.
202	DOI	The term 'should' is used consistently in the document. The language in the DOI does not convey conviction and follow through that matches the tone of the <u>Public Participation Guidelines</u> . The text must be improved to provide greater cohesiveness to the Guidelines and the Policy documents.	Conditional statements of intent (would and should) in the Public Participation Manual for Park Planning have been changed to their unconditional form (will and shall) when describing actions that will be implemented without exception, regardless of context or circumstance. Where actions are indeed conditional, the verb forms 'would' and 'should' are retained. The Public Participation Manual (formerly the DOI) has been extensively rewritten to more fully conform to the Guidelines and Policy document.
203	DOI	The DOI also needs a statement referencing accountability for actions and inactions that may occur which do not match the Operation Instructions.	I'm having trouble interpreting this comment, and therefore am unable to provide a response. If in reference to ramifications or disciplinary actions, it is inappropriate in the new format of a Manual for planning actions
204	DOI	<b>1.0 Purpose.</b> Include some reference to meaningful public involvement in this purpose statement. For example: "To establish procedures for developing a City Council adopted Park Master Plan, Master Plan Amendment, or Revision and meaningfully involving the public in this process." The rest of the sentence is unnecessary.	The purpose statement has been rewritten and now specifies as its goal to, "ensure an effective and efficient process to fairly and equitably maximize citizen input in and support for the planning and development of Raleigh's park system."
205	DOI	<b>1.0 Purpose.</b> This section should define what a park master plan is and also state the purpose of a park master plan. I recommend using the language in Res 2003-735.	Definitions of park planning activities and outputs (plans, plan revisions, etc.) are now fully described in the Public Participation Manual.
206	DOI	<b>2.0 Organizations.</b> The only organizations referred to here are only City of Raleigh groups. There are many others, both in the public and private sectors, to whom this policy applies or should apply.	The Public Participation Manual now mentions the role of agencies and organizations outside the City of Raleigh.
207	DOI	<b>3.0 References</b> Include reference to the Raleigh 2030 Comprehensive Plan as 3.4.	The Raleigh Comprehensive Plan is referred to in the Manual under the discussion of links to the Capital Improvement Plan, and under the section titled "System Integration Plan."
208	DOI	<b>4.1.</b> Provide title: <u>Necessity for a Master Plan or Master Plan Revision or Amendment</u> . There have been problems in the past of the Parks Dept. beginning development projects that do not conform with adopted master plans and using other loopholes to get around public participation. That is why the "Is a master plan needed?" section was written into Res 2003-735. It is important to retain this clarity for accountability purposes and for there to be clear expectations about the circumstances under which some sort of master plan should be done with public involvement.	The Public Participation Manual provides clear and specific guidance on the park planning and development process. The requirements for planning and public involvement are clearly spelled out in the document.
209	DOI	<b>4.2.</b> Provide title: <u>Use Best Practices in Public Involvement</u> . This section should beef up language indicating that it is referring to public participation. Recommend: "The public will be engaged in park master planning using, at a minimum, best practices for public involvement described in 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 References above." Delete "whenever possible" as this dilutes the statement.	The Public Participation Manual now clearly links the best practices of public participation with specific planning activities carried out by the Department.
210	DOI	<b>4.3.</b> Provide title: <u>Roles and Responsibilities of Parties</u> . Delete "as appropriate" and "City Manager." It is important for accountability purposes to maintain City Council as the only body who can override or deviate from the direction provided in these policy documents, they are the officials elected to make policy.	The section in the Public Participation Manual that discusses the roles and responsibilities of specific organizations in the planning process has been expanded and improved.
211	DOI	<b>4.4.</b> Provide title: <u>Participation of Other Agencies</u> .	The Public Participation Manual now contains information on the roles of other agencies in park planning.
212	DOI	<b>4.5.</b> Provide title: <u>System Integration Planning</u> . To make this consistent with the recommendation in NRL's "Involving the Public" report and to remove any confusion, remove the words "newly acquired" and replace them with "currently owned but as yet unplanned and".	The Public Participation Manual uses the term, "currently owned undeveloped properties" when referring to System Integration Planning.
213	DOI	<b>4.5.</b> Resolution 2003-735 included an important statement that should be retained here: "The SIP is not intended to restrict the master planning process."	The following sentence has been included in the description of System Integration Planning: "The SIP is intended to inform, not restrict the Master Plan process."
214	DOI	<b>4.5.</b> To clarify that SIP processes should also follow best practices for public involvement (this is even more important now with the changes that are being proposed) include a statement here like: "System integration planning should abide by best practice public participation as described in 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 References above."	The following statement has been added to the Public Participation Manual in the System Integration Planning section, ". Public involvement will follow the practices referenced in Section 3.0 above." Section 3.0 references the Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Guidelines.

215	DOI	<b>4.5.1</b> This sentence is very unclear and introduces a totally new concept that needs review and discussion. Suggest revising as follows: "(The SIP will include, at a minimum:) "The proposed park classification consistent with the 2030 Comprehensive Plan, and if applicable, any proposed special intent for the park stated by City Council."	This statement has been rewritten in the Public Participation Manual to read, "The SIP will include, at a minimum: Comprehensive Plan correlation to the acquisition of property and provision of a system-wide municipal park and recreation program for the City of Raleigh as well as the continuum of park, recreation and open space services for Wake County and the Triangle region."
216	DOI	<b>4.5.1.</b> Remove the reference to "the continuum of park, rec, and open space services for Wake County and the Triangle region."	The statement was retained in the current draft of the Public Participation Manual because we felt that it accurately represents the broad context of services addressed by the Comprehensive Plan.
217	DOI	<b>4.5.2</b> Delete and replace with "Other information that may influence the interim or long term management of the property, including deed restrictions, grant provisions, lease arrangements, easements, or partnerships."	"Special Intent or purpose" is exactly the point here, therefore the language is appropriate and retained.
218	DOI	<b>4.5.4</b> The way that Res 2003-735 addressed natural resource inventory information was more complete and preferable; add back in "shall include tree, flora and fauna inventories, inventory of historical data... inventory of archeological data... and the section at the bottom of page 9: "The tree, flora, fauna ecological, historical and archeological inventories should be performed by staff or consultants specifically qualified to perform such inventories. These findings shall be presented to the PRGAB for review in their entirety with attached staff comment."	The subsection dealing with natural resource inventory has been rewritten in the Public Participation Manual to read, "The inventory will be conducted by the City of Raleigh Land Stewardship Coordinator utilizing appropriate subject matter experts. This effort will begin with an initial assessment to determine if resources or features are significant by established standards such as those of the NC Natural Heritage Program, the NC Office of State Archaeology and/or the NC State Historic Preservation Office. These agencies, and others if appropriate, will be solicited for input as well as appropriate non-governmental, non-profit and/or special interest groups as necessary to fully evaluate the site and build support for stewardship."
219	DOI	<b>4.5.4.</b> Add "Inventory shall help provide direction and guidance for management and future direction of property use and development."	Added "including the appropriate conservation of natural and cultural resources" to 5.5 Interim management recommendations.
220	DOI	<b>4.5.5</b> Revise as follows: "An interim management plan that protects natural resource value and quality from the time the property is purchased to the time it is master planned and developed into a new park facility."	This subsection has been rewritten in the Public Participation Manual to read, "[The SIP will include, at a minimum]: Interim management recommendations for the foreseeable future until a Master Plan is adopted and development is implemented. The recommendations will address the previous items [natural resources and cultural features]. An Action Plan that assigns responsibility and time frames will be part of the management recommendations.
221	DOI	<b>4.5.6</b> Delete this and state instead: "Opportunity for public participation consistent with 3.1, 3.2, and 3.3 References above. Public notification of the SIP process shall be given to the City Council, the PRGAB, CACs, appropriate advisory boards, nearby neighborhood organizations, and others who request this information."	The following statement has been added to the Public Participation Manual in the System Integration Planning section, ". Public involvement will follow the practices referenced in Section 3.0 above." Section 3.0 references the Public Participation Policy and the Public Participation Guidelines.
222	DOI	<b>5.0.</b> Add an "s" after "Master Plan".	Done.
223	DOI	<b>5.0.</b> Add "For acquired but undeveloped park property, a master plan derived with best practice public involvement is required before any development for public use."	Done. See General Guidelines 4.1 Master Plan and 6.0 Master Plan.
224	DOI	<b>5.0.</b> Question: how would it ever be practically possible for the public to question the Parks Director's decision that a major renovation or redevelopment would/would not substantially modify the park's use or appearance?	Citizen, PRGAB City Manager or Council can all question absence of public information or opportunity for input.
225	DOI	<b>5.0.</b> Delete reference to definitions in other policy when you (hopefully) combine these two documents.	The three documents have remained separate. All definitions are now consistent between documents.
226	DOI	<b>Procedure 5.1 and 5.2</b> – is this included in CIP? Is "CIP" a broad term to cover all types of improvements?	Master Plan actions are included in the CIP; see Section 4.11
227	DOI	<b>5.1.</b> Provide title: <a href="#">Link to Capital Improvement Program (CIP)</a> .	A discussion of the relationship of parks and recreation planning and public participation to the Capital Improvement Plan is contained in the Public Participation Manual (Section 4.11).
228	DOI	<b>5.1</b> Delete everything but the first sentence in this section. This proposal removes important information from the public domain and reduces transparency significantly. All master plan actions, not just Phase 1, should identify the park by name in the CIP for greater transparency and accountability. The City should be up front and specific about what it is proposing so that the public can be informed and have an opportunity to comment at budget hearings.	Phase 1 refers to the CIP (years 1-5) NOT Phase 1 of park [action]. Section 4.11
229	DOI	<b>5.2.</b> Changes statement is a new concept and not clear. What is the intent here and how is this information made available to the public?	This statement is now referenced in the subsection of the Public Participation Manual that addresses the Capital Improvements Plan. In addition, the following statement is also included in this section, "Major renovations or redevelopment, such as a replacement of a building system (roof, mechanical, etc.), playground, repaving or other capital asset may be included in the CIP as part of a larger line item of improvements or upgrades. This does not remove the need for public outreach and information exchange in both recommending and implementing major renovations."
230	DOI	<b>5.2</b> This still relates to 5.1 subject and should be rolled into that section. It appears that major renovations or redevelopment could be approved in the CIP without the public having an ability to review and comment because it would be buried in a larger line item. This is not transparent or in the spirit of providing full information to the public.	The statement about major renovations or redevelopment is now incorporated in the subsection of the Public Participation Manual that addresses the Capital Improvements Plan.
231	DOI	<b>5.3.</b> Provide title: <a href="#">Process Design</a> .	Done.
232	DOI	<b>5.3.</b> This statement should be consistent with the other documents (see also pages 4 and 5 or Pub Part Policy). It should be made clear, as it is on page 5, that City Council has final approval of process design for accountability and transparency purposes.	The Procedures section of the Public Participation Manual has been rewritten and now conforms with the process flowchart contained in the Public Participation Policy document.
233	DOI	<b>5.3.</b> The proposed process design needs to be fully and clearly articulated in writing for public review and comment and Council approval. Without a more prescriptive policy like that of Res 2003-735, the public will not know what to expect if this is not done. Transparency and accountability would be impossible without this important step. (see how this links to 5.6.2)	The Procedures section of the Public Participation Manual has been rewritten and now conforms with the process flowchart contained in the Public Participation Policy document.
234	DOI	What is "process design" in <b>5.3.1 and 5.3.2</b> ? Is it "design process"?	The term "process design" refers to the form and operation of the public participation process that the Department will employ.

235	DOI	<b>5.3.1</b> Should split up this item into two: one for the selection of the consultant and one for the consultant's role in process design. This should also refer to the importance for selection criteria to include expertise in collaborative decision making and conflict management, as well as public participation process design.	The role and responsibilities of the consultant is more clearly defined in the Public Participation Manual.
236	DOI	<b>5.3.2</b> This sentence is confusing. On one hand it sounds like the PRGAB should be engaged in process design, and on the other hand it sounds like the policy wants the board to be participating in committees, teams or community meetings, although it's not clear how that should take place. Until the board is well trained in public process design, they should not have a role in this aspect. The board's expected role in committees, teams, or community meetings should be more clearly articulated in this policy.	The description of role of the PRGAB in public participation and park planning is clarified and expanded in the Public Participation Manual.
237	DOI	<b>5.4.</b> Provide title: <u>Notifications</u> . Public notification is an extremely basic and important aspect of park master planning, so that people are aware of planning efforts and can participate. This section significantly dilutes the existing policy in many ways. The language leaves many openings for the staff to not follow through, thus a lack of accountability is supported ("make a concerted effort", "strive to achieve", "strive for", etc.) Notification processes and procedures should be crystal clear and followed at all times. You should go back to Res 2003-735 and incorporate that language.	Procedures for public notification are clarified and expanded in the Public Participation Manual.
238	DOI	<b>5.4.</b> This new concept of notifying neighbors of a neighborhood park only in a ½ mile radius should be revised. The expectation for "wide ranging" parks is not clear. Park planning efforts for parks of citywide interest (metro, nature park or preserve, greenway, special) should make an effort to broadcast information through all available means (TV, press releases, Community TV, website, etc.) For Neighborhood Parks, the City should attempt to send notification to a 1 mile radius or the entire surrounding neighborhood, based on the neighborhood's own definition (the CAC's or homeowners associations can help with definition or boundaries, whichever is greater).	The Public Participation Manual provides clearer guidance on notification requirements stating that, "The Department will make a specific and concerted effort to notify individuals and groups affected by the planning action and/or potential development or redevelopment process. The level of notice should be commensurate with the scale and scope of the project and strive to achieve accepted best practices referenced in the Resources in Section 3 [the Public Participation Policy document and the Public Participation Guidance document]."
239	DOI	<b>5.4.1</b> concur that for Community Parks at 2 mile service area notification is appropriate.	Noted.
240	DOI	<b>5.4.1.</b> This is inadequate. The Resolution notification process has served the public well and should be followed – it should replace all of this, which is unclear about how it will be done.	The Public Participation Manual provides clearer guidance on notification requirements stating that, "The Department will make a specific and concerted effort to notify individuals and groups affected by the planning action and/or potential development or redevelopment process. The level of notice should be commensurate with the scale and scope of the project and strive to achieve accepted best practices referenced in the Resources in Section 3 [the Public Participation Policy document and the Public Participation Guidance document]."
241	DOI	<b>5.4.1.</b> The last sentence of this section is very unclear, as it combines <u>who</u> (CACs and Boards and Commissions) with <u>what</u> (effective signage). Again, please go back and rewrite including all the provisions of Res 2003-735.	Procedures for public notification are clarified and expanded in the Public Participation Manual.
242	DOI	<b>5.4.1.</b> It should be written in this document that the public has a right to request to be included in park planning effort notifications and communications at any time, and that the City will put them on a mailing list for interested parties and send them all pertinent correspondence.	The Public Participation Manual contains the following statement, "Citizens will have the opportunity to receive a notice that meetings are scheduled, or updated project information is available by providing E-mail or postal route addresses."
243	DOI	<b>5.4.2</b> Publishing a meeting process schedule on line and keeping it updated at all times is a good idea. "Striving for" two week notification is not enough.	The Public Participation Manual now states in Section 6.3.5, "Notice of any initiation of a planning effort will occur at least 30 days prior to an event."
244	DOI	<b>5.4.2.</b> The statement that all meetings should at a minimum meet statutory requirements for advertising and conducting public meetings is not acceptable. First of all, without City Council setting up a "public body"/master planning committee, NC Open Meetings Laws do not apply. Without NC Open Meetings Laws not applying, requirements for the public to be allowed to attend and good minutes to be taken do not exist. Notice requirements, even with State Open Meetings Laws, are much shorter than what would be appropriate for park planning meetings (they are 48 hours and only a notice needs to be placed on a bulletin board in City Hall). This was a big problem with the core team/community meeting format in the past, and it greatly contributes to the sense of distrust that the public has. Meetings where decisions were made took place behind the scenes and the public was not able to attend. In addition, the Parks Department has broken Open Meetings Laws related to park planning efforts in the past. Because of this history, this	Notification is clear and consistent in both Policy and Manual. Minimum 30 days for initial meetings/14 days for subsequent meeting(s).
245	DOI	<b>5.4.4</b> Unclear; recommend revising as follows: "The times, locations and frequency of meetings shall attempt to maximize the opportunity for citizens to participate in planning meetings. Park planning meetings will be held in an accessible location as close to the park as practical."	Done; section 7.3.9
246	DOI	<b>5.5</b> Provide title: <u>Public Input Incorporation</u> .	The Public Participation Manual now contains an expanded section titled, Public Input and Participation.
247	DOI	<b>5.5.</b> This section is unclear and should be entirely revised. At this point in the document it would be refreshing and encouraging to include something about the City's commitment to making park master plans a reflection of public input.	A new section titled, Public Input and Participation, in the Public Participation Manual clearly outlines the process that Department staff will undertake to enhance public input into parks and recreation planning processes.
248	DOI	<b>5.5.</b> What are master plan "actions"? Steps in the master planning process? It may be better to refer to the Public Participation Policy and Guidelines here after making a broad positive statement of intent. This "commensurate with the scope and the scale of the project" is unclear and should be removed.	A new section titled, Public Input and Participation, in the Public Participation Manual clearly outlines the process that Department staff will undertake to enhance public input into parks and recreation planning processes. The process described here coincides with the process description and flowchart contained in the Public Participation Policy document.

249	DOI	5.5.1 What does this mean? Clarify. Is this speaking to how public input will be incorporated? If so, it should be explicit.	A new section titled, Public Input and Participation, in the Public Participation Manual clearly outlines the process that Department staff will undertake to enhance public input into parks and recreation planning processes. The process described here coincides with the process description and flowchart contained in the Public Participation Policy document.
250	DOI	5.5.2 Again, "commensurate with the nature of the planning process" is unclear and could mean anything. There is no standard for accountability here.	The recording of public input is now treated more thoroughly in the Public Participation Manual in Section 4.10 titled, Incorporation of Public Input. The statement "commensurate with the nature of the planning process" is followed by examples to add clarity and meaning to the statement.
251	DOI	5.5.2. I believe that all public park planning meetings should be video recorded and archived so that if questions arise later, there is a reference tool. This is done in other jurisdictions (I know Mecklenburg County used to do it and probably still do.)	Will consider recording major public meetings and/or presentations by Raleigh Television Network (RTN) as resources allow.
252	DOI	5.5.2. All meeting agendas, minutes, and related information should be maintained on the City's webpage for that particular park planning effort throughout the process. This should be stated in this document.	The Public Participation Manual now includes the following statement in Section 4.10.2, "... records of public input shall be maintained by the Department and will be further included in process records as appendices, meeting minutes, and/or summaries as Master Plan action recommendations are presented for consideration by appointed bodies and elected officials."
253	DOI	5.6 Provide title: <u>Internal and External Review and Comment.</u>	A new section (Section 6.5) in the Public Participation Manual is titled "Internal and External Review."
254	DOI	5.6. This section is very mixed up and should be separated as I have outlined below (5.7 relating to 5.6.3 and 5.8 relating to 5.6.4)	Section 6.5 in the Public Participation Manual addresses review and comment by internal and external parties. The section has been reduced to two subsections, one on internal (City of Raleigh) review, and the other on external (entities other than the City of Raleigh).
255	DOI	5.6. All comments received should be accessible to the public on the park project webpage throughout the process.	The Public Participation Manual now includes the following statement in Section 4.10.2, "... records of public input shall be maintained by the Department and will be further included in process records as appendices, meeting minutes, and/or summaries as Master Plan action recommendations are presented for consideration by appointed bodies and elected officials."
256	DOI	5.6.2 Again, this statement is unclear – state the purpose of this review and oversight.	The section in the Public Participation Manual on internal review (Section 6.5.1) has been rewritten to read, "In order to ensure consistency with Department and City practices, policies and codes an internal review on an on-going basis shall be by a Design Resource Team of inter-departmental professional staff as well as the City of Raleigh Development Services group at appropriate stages. This effort shall culminate in review by City Administration. Summary of these reviews will be included in the project records as the draft is prepared and presented for official action.
257	DOI	5.7 Provide title: <u>Design Phase.</u>	Done; <b>All comments below addressed</b> in two new sections, <u>Post Adoption or Schematic Design Input</u> and <u>Post Process/Implementation Evaluation</u>
258	DOI	5.7. Replace what is written in this document with section V. Design from the Res 2003-735. This maintains accountability to the process and will keep the construction more in line with the adopted master plan.	
259	DOI	5.7. It is unclear how these "designated committees or core teams will be set up. Will they be set up just for this purpose? Or will this be a master planning committee meeting to review the schematics for consistency with their master plan?	
260	DOI	5.8 Provide title: <u>Evaluation.</u>	
261	DOI	5.8.1 The planning process design and implementation should be reviewed by the Design Review Team. Citizens on the PRGAB as well as those who participated in the process shall be mailed surveys to get their feedback on the effectiveness and experience of the planning effort.	
262	DOI	5.8.2 Please add this language, most of it from Res 2003-735: After each major phase of development and construction, the park facilities and customer satisfaction with the facilities will be evaluated by the staff through user surveys. Both program and non-program users will be surveyed. The objective of these evaluations is to identify improvements that the City can make to improve functioning of the park. The staff will prepare a report to the PRGAB and the planning consultant including information from a public survey or comment. The PRGAB shall report to the City Council as they deem appropriate.	

**COMMENTS NOT REQUIRING A RESONSE**

263	General	Definitely still some past experience still haunting the public participation process.	
-----	---------	--	--

264	General	<p>I was part of one of the Park's committees that invited the public to be part of the meetings. Let me first say that think involving the public into the decisions early on is a good idea. In addition, having a good representation of the local public to the park is important.</p> <p>I found the process of developing this park in committee very informative and by itself very workable. The most important thing that went wrong with the process of development of this park lies solely with those who were implementing the process. I want to keep this as concise as possible, so I will list my concerns.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"><li>1. The majority of the members of the committee were either working for or with the parks department. Hence, the voting was shall we say "in the bag" If these committee members went against what became clear the parks department wanted in that location, they felt their jobs or advancements were in jeopardy. This is not pure speculation on my part. They would talk to me on the phone and give me ideas and alternatives to what the committee was proposing. ( the alternatives were prompted by better usage of</li></ol>	
-----	---------	---	--